



# Agenda

## Minnetonka Park Board

Wednesday, October 5, 2022 at 6:30 p.m.  
Minnetonka Community Center - Minnehaha Room

---

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

\_\_\_\_\_ Isabelle Stroh

\_\_\_\_\_ Korey Beyersdorf

\_\_\_\_\_ James Durbin

\_\_\_\_\_ Chris Gabler

\_\_\_\_\_ David Ingraham

\_\_\_\_\_ Ben Jacobs

\_\_\_\_\_ Katie Semersky

\_\_\_\_\_ Chris Walick

3. Reports from Staff

4. Approval of Minutes

A) September 7, 2022

5. Citizens wishing to discuss items not on the agenda

6. Special Matters

7. Business Items

A) Guidelines for Evaluating Resident  
Requests for Special Projects

B) Consideration of 2023 Boat Slip Rates for  
Gray's Bay Marina

C) Review 2022 Athletic Field Use and  
Consideration of the 2023 Fee Schedule

8. Park Board Member Reports

9. Information Items

10. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

11. Adjournment

### Board Vision:

A city with outstanding parks and recreational opportunities within a valued natural environment.

### Board Mission:

The mission of the Minnetonka Parks & Recreation Board is to proactively advise the city council, in ways that will:

- Protect & enhance Minnetonka's natural environment
- Promote quality recreation opportunities and facilities
- Provide a forum for citizens interested in our parks, trails, athletic fields and open space.



**Minutes  
Minnetonka Park Board  
Wednesday, September 7, 2022**

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Roll Call**

Park board members present: Korey Beyersdorf, James Durbin, Chris Gabler, David Ingraham, Ben Jacobs, Katie Semersky and Isabelle Stroh. Excused: Chris Walick.

Staff members in attendance: Matt Kumka, Kelly O'Dea, Sara Woeste and Leslie Yetka.

Chair Gabler called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**3. Reports from Staff**

Recreation Director Kelly O'Dea reminded park board members to have their audio devices close to them.

**4. Approval of Minutes**

Jacobs moved, Beyersdorf seconded a motion to approve the meeting minutes of Aug. 3, 2022 as submitted. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**5. Citizens wishing to discuss items not on the agenda**

This was discussed after Business Item 7A. Else Goll, a math teacher at Minnetonka Middle School East who has previously addressed the board with her skateboarders, addressed the board with the following comments. Goll stated that it was the second day of school and it was hard to get a crew of them here so she is speaking on their behalf. Goll founded the Minnesota Skateboard League and has been running it for five years. There are consistently 50-70 skaters at just one middle school and it is the biggest club; it rivals larger sports that are more mainstream. The kind of students that join are everyone from a typical kid who loves sports to maybe a student that is neurodivergent and doesn't participate in team sports. There is a well-rounded group of kids so she wants to make sure all of them are seen in all of this. On the first day of school students that weren't even in her class came to ask her what the progress is on the skate park. They are very excited and she was pleased to tell them that the city is moving forward and looking at feasibility to see if they can make this happen. However, telling them that potential groundbreaking could be years from now, to a 12 or 14 year old, it seems like a lifetime. She requested that the board consider doing a stop-gap measure of a less expensive Skatelite half-pipe ramp on the existing Glen Lake site. The blacktop is a mess, the obstacles are not rideable and the obstacles aren't ones that skateboarders want to ride because of the way they are constructed, the materials used and the layout. Rather than maintaining and repairing items, she asked if they could go a different direction that is not super expensive. It would get them through the next two years and kids could start using it immediately. A Skatelite 20 foot half-pipe is more reasonably priced, the materials are readily available, they are durable and it's not a temporary item. It

is something that could be there for decades if it is properly maintained and repaired as needed. It might be a nice compliment if you are still thinking of the Glen Lake site where the playground is. You could keep the half-pipe there and maybe consider a bowl park and then have some street course elements. You could have all three types of parks in one location. If you don't know about skateboarding, there are many different ways that you can compete. There could be three representations there or another option would be to have two representations if you had a half-pipe and a bowl transition park. Goll reminded everyone that they are the only school sanctioned skateboard league that they are aware of in the state of Minnesota and they are one of the few cities in the Twin Cities that doesn't have a skate park. They are kind of paving the way because she is being asked by people to come into school districts and help them start skate parks. They are being used as an example on what to do for youth and reaching out to find out what they are interested in. Skateboarding is an Olympic sport now and it's not going anywhere; it is only growing. She and the kids are both excited to work with everyone.

O'Dea said this is kind of like what they were talking about in Business Item 7A.

Gabler reminded everyone that the first time this was brought up, there were a bunch of kids who spoke at the meeting and they supported the skate park. It is good when kids get involved. He said that he is around Round Lake Park in Eden Prairie all the time and it is always busy.

Goll said it is busy all the time.

Gabler added that people usually clean up after themselves; it is always pretty clean there.

Durbin questioned if Goll knew the demand at Minnetonka Middle School West or at the Hopkins schools. He mentioned that she just has a small sliver of kids that are bugging her. He also questioned if this is more of a maintenance request for Street and Park Operations Manager Darin Ellingson. It seems like this would be similar to replacing playground equipment.

O'Dea thought that was kind of right. Goll was correct that the earliest something would be done with a new skate park would be 2024. Staff is looking at feasibility and some design in 2023 or potentially in 2024. Staff was interested to know why the current skate park wasn't being used much.

Goll said she could bring in kids to explain that to you.

O'Dea replied that staff has gotten feedback on why it's not being used as much. He said the questions are:

- What type of equipment?
- How much does it cost?
- What does staff need to budget for?
- Is this an operational item that staff can try and get into the 2023 budget?
- Is the park board supportive of staff looking into putting some dollars into a facility knowing that it potentially is going to be upgraded in a couple years?

Durbin questioned if Glen Lake was being considered as a possible site for the final skate park. If not, it would be sad to put something new there if it couldn't be dismantled and put

into the new space. He would hate to build something just to have it there for a few years. He also understands that you don't have a location and it is something that would take time. We've gotten a lot of feedback that the Glen Lake area is not a great place to have a skate park.

Jacobs asked if that is the location we are looking at. Would this be a band aid or would this be in addition to something? Would this equipment stay there for people to use?

Beyersdorf wondered if we build a new skate park, would the old one be demolished or would it stay there.

Park and Trail Project Manager Matt Kumka said they are looking at that area but it was quickly determined that the existing footprint is too small. They are looking at, for instance, there is a playground on the other side of the dog groomer's site and they have looked at that parcel being more significantly sized. Then looking at what would the potential be for relocating the playground down to the existing skate park area. He thought the goal with putting in a ramp was that it would be moveable to potentially another location. They are hearing from their skate park feasibility consultant that there is an option for one large significant regional park but then there could be another smaller site somewhere in the city. For the ramp, the options would exist for it to be relocated to another location somewhere in the city.

Ingraham asked if the current equipment at Glen Lake is safe.

Kumka responded that feedback is saying that it is not safe.

Ingraham said that we could take out the existing equipment and do nothing with it or they could do this idea.

Kumka replied that some of those obstacles are quite outdated. The preferred option would be to put in a half-pipe on that site. It would be a unique feature for this area and it's endlessly skateable. This is what the kids are asking for essentially. Staff spoke to a ramp builder when they were pursuing this idea and they said that half-pipes get a ton of use. It would be plopped down on that site and could be ready to skate on in a relatively short order. However, the other stuff would have to get out of the way.

Goll said you wouldn't have to resurface it. The half-pipe would just go on top and it would save you money.

O'Dea agreed with Ingraham that there is a difference between something that's not safe and something that is just not fun.

Ingraham said he worries about the safety. A new mural is going in at that location on Saturday so we are investing in that location.

O'Dea thought it got pushed back a week but a new mural is going in.

Durbin questioned if this was a park board matter or if it is something for Ellingson. When playground equipment gets changed out, staff just informs the park board about it.

O'Dea explained that Ellingson has a replacement schedule for playground equipment in our park system.

Ingraham commented that the replacement schedule doesn't fit this.

O'Dea said there is a safety issue that they have to address sooner than they may have thought in the past. With some of our play equipment, there could be swings out there that are safe but not fun anymore; that doesn't mean they are going to replace them. If there are safety issues, then yes, something needs to be done. If funding wasn't budgeted or available, the easiest thing to do would be remove it and not put anything in. First, they need to make sure the equipment is safe. Secondly, they need to look at funding. He thinks some of the options that they looked at were large enough where they didn't have that sitting in our current operation budget.

Durbin asked if there is a mechanism to get that.

O'Dea said potentially. Staff is working on our operations budget for 2023. Our Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is already set and will be approved at one of the next council meetings. He thinks staff could look into getting something into their operational budget for 2023. That would be the most reasonable way to do something if the park board is supportive of doing that.

Gabler thought the biggest selling point is the fact it is a safety issue. The city is liable if it's not safe.

O'Dea wasn't sure if an independent consultant has come out yet to say it is not safe. Staff would have to verify the safety issue, but he agrees that we don't want unsafe equipment in our park system.

Semersky noted that we are talking about the skate park feasibility in November and asked if a good next step would be to include that idea as part of that. Another option would be to evaluate it as part of the overall feasibility since it is around the corner.

Kumka responded that would make sense because what he is describing is more of a regional, permanent thing. This is a potential add-on and would be moved in the future. That is all going to be discussed in the feasibility study.

Durbin suggested keeping them separate. If there is a maintenance and safety issue, it could go through a different pathway because it doesn't need the park board. He recommended having Ellingson find some money, if the city thinks this needs to be done.

Ingraham said this goes into that democracy part.

Durbin added that when Ellingson changes out playground equipment, he doesn't consult with the park board about which brand to buy. To him, this is similar to an unsafe swing set.

O'Dea suggested having him and Kumka discuss this with Ellingson and Public Works Director Will Manchester to see how they can handle this and give them an update in November. He thinks there is a demand for newer and updated features so they'll work with Ellingson and Manchester to find a remedy.

## **6. Special Matters**

There were none.

## **7. Business Items**

### **A. Guidelines for Evaluating Resident Requests for Special Projects.**

O'Dea gave the report.

Ingraham liked the focus on the formatting and checklist and he is supportive of the questions identified. He added that the skate park wouldn't have passed this because there wasn't a specific site. They couldn't have answered if the city owns it or if it was accessible because they didn't know the site. He wondered what they would do with something like that because it is a good project that they have been evaluating. At first he thought the form would work really well but then he thought about the skate park. What would happen if someone came in with an idea but they didn't know where it might go but you thought it would be worth looking into?

O'Dea thought that was a good point. He agreed that the skate park is a good potential project that they should be evaluating. Maybe they could change some of the questions or maybe they don't need as many yes'.

Beyersdorf questioned if it could be more of a sliding scale such as ranking them from one to five; one being it isn't feasible and five being it is. In the proposed way, if you have too many no's the project is done. The sliding scale would give it a little more wiggle room in how you are deciding everything.

Durbin thought there should be something to the extent that Beyersdorf proposed or maybe someone has to have five or more yes'. Then at the bottom, there could be an area to agree if they think it is a good idea to investigate anyway. They should be able to research or investigate items that don't meet the criteria. He really liked that number one and two are solids but the other ones are kind of softer. For number three, sometimes they might not know if there is enough support until there is outreach. Showing support is sometimes in that next step when they want staff to do outreach.

O'Dea replied that staff struggled with that one too. They may get one request from one resident over three years and that doesn't show a demand to them. Then you get a group of people who want a mountain bike trail or a skate park and there is a large group and some even provide a petition.

Natural Resources Manager Leslie Yetka said this is meant to be a tool so there could be questions that fall under the unknown category, a good example of that is the skate park. Answering yes and no gives staff information in order to decide on what their next steps would be. If there are a lot of unknowns, then they really don't know enough information.

Semersky commented that it would help her talk to residents. She could tell them that there are two unknowns and ask them to learn more about those before they can investigate further.

Durbin added that part of the next steps could be to figure out what the unknowns are and see if they can come up with yes' or no's. They don't have to toss it in the trash because it doesn't meet them at that moment. He likes the ambiguity and that it isn't all yes's or no's. He appreciated the fact that there is some criteria and a form to have some standardization. The most important step is to have a historical document indicating the request and how it was rated.

Gabler liked one and two but recommended turning numbers three through 10 into more of a request for proposal (RFP). Then if somebody wants to come to the park board with a proposal, they can write it based on these items, rather than checking off yes or no. Let the petitioners come in and fill it out and see if it meets the criteria for numbers one and two.

Beyersdorf added that if you give them the criteria then there won't be unknowns. That is because they would be able to answer those questions before it reaches the park board.

Ingraham said the most important criteria on numbers three through 10 is number three. Number three is their interest and it shows how much interest. The other ones are more the tactics around it. He goes back to the skate park and how it would be really good to have one. Then you start asking where it will be located and if there is funding for it. They aren't going to know those answers but if you have a lot of people say they want it; they will probably work pretty hard to go through the steps.

Jacobs liked it as a tool. The first two are good and he kind of broke it into three sections. First, you find out if it passes the first two criteria. Second, he broke it down into a demand part that is going to require outreach and feasibility. Third, you come back and answer the other questions about location, funding, etc. He also mentioned that the project they were evaluating at the last meeting would've had enough yes' to go through, however, they wouldn't have answered number three. That is where they would've stopped.

Ingraham wanted to verify it was regarding the neighborhood park.

Jacobs said yes. There was demand for the neighborhood park so they would've stopped at number three. They could go through and say yes or no to the rest of them but it doesn't really matter because they were still at number three. So break it into three parts and then decide what it would do to that community. Maybe make a section that says that there is demand and it will not change the area, then move onto the next part.

Gabler added that he would like to see if there is an opportunity for public/private partnership. If a project comes in that people are behind and there is public/private partnerships, it is an easier sell to the park board and council.

Durbin doesn't think this needs to be on the form but what if the park board requests that anything moving forward needs the park board support. There could be somebody that comes up with a plan and they meet all this criteria, however, the park board doesn't want to do it. For example, someone wants to put in a rocket ship pad for drones and they get all the yes' but the park board doesn't want to do that and they don't want to recommend it to the city council. There has to be something that says the park board doesn't have to do the project even if it meets all the criteria. He is pretty happy with the form and thought Jacobs' point was correct.

Ingraham said most examples are facility based projects. He asked if it was possible for a program or activity to fit this. An example would be a farmer's market.

O'Dea replied that typically when there is a program request, it comes through our department. Then staff evaluates the need for it and they have certain criteria for that.

Yetka added that she would say the same about a program. This is more project based in terms of something being built or infrastructure related. A good example would be the park board saw the proposal for the habitat restoration in a park. If you recall it was the pollinator planting, which was actually a change in land use. It was removing turf and converting it to a natural area. That is why there was a question about land use.

Gabler thought that if someone has an idea for a park or something, they will take care of number three if they are passionate about it. Bring the park board the support rather than them trying to find the support. Then it is effective and you this is a passionate group that you can have a conversation with.

Jacobs commented that last month's group regarding building a park didn't even have a clear answer on if it was going to happen.

Durbin added that they could've brought more people and thought that they probably wanted to make sure that all voices were heard. Come out with at least an initial bang and have like 100 people say that you want something or at least a lot more than just one.

Gabler said that is what pickleball and mountain bike people did and they came in force.

Durbin appreciated that this would also work for nature conservation. He was wondering if Lone Lake Park would fit into that because it was a big deal. That was money spent and it changed the shape of a park. We are going to get other things like that.

Beyersdorf asked how they would judge what significant demand or support is on number three. Is it the number of people or a percentage? She questioned if criteria needs to be put in place so they can decide if it reaches that criteria for them to move on.

Semersky said it would depend on the project scope because they would have to decide by project how much significance it would be.

O'Dea gave the example of the request they heard last week. There were eight neighbors and let's say six of the neighbors said they wanted it. Would you say that is support or would you say at least 50 percent is support? He wasn't sure what the answer to that question would be. He thought the neighborhood requests are different than the community level requests though.

Woeste asked if it would be helpful to remove the word significant. It is hard to answer what significant is.

Jacobs thought it leaves some ambiguity. If it is five to four, it doesn't mean they are definitely going to do it.



Beyersdorf thinks regardless if you have the word in there or not, the meaning is the same. Whether it is significant demand or demand in general, what is the demand?

Durbin thought it also depended on who is filling out the form. He thinks you could get three different answers if staff, the applicant or the park board fills it out. Obviously they want to work with the staff and help get these answers and get their expertise on whether or not this is significant. Maybe this is soft enough and they put it as a next step. If they aren't sure, they ask them to investigate more. It's not like they have to pass it and fund it in one night. They can keep it moving and investigate it some more.

Gabler would change the wording of number three from "is there significant demand" to "how much demand or support is there."

Beyersdorf added that for the first three questions, they need to have a yes for them. However, for number three, the people who are coming in should know how much support they are supposed to have when they show up. It's not fair for them to do all the leg work and show up thinking they have enough support, then finding out that they don't have enough support when they get there.

O'Dea agreed that it is challenging. He could see someone coming in saying they want more pickleball courts and their support is that they are at Lone Lake Park and the courts are full every morning. Does that show enough demand to build more courts?

Beyersdorf asked if they are telling people they need to do a petition or a neighborhood survey. What are they supposed to do to get that information to us?

Jacobs questioned the neighborhood park that was proposed the previous month. Would you just go to the neighborhood and knock on doors?

O'Dea thought that one was a little different. We aren't sure whether or not they wanted to donate the land, but we thought we knew.

Ingraham agreed and thought that even if the city wanted it, they still might've changed their mind.

O'Dea said it seemed like they weren't all on the same page and staff didn't know that. If we had a request from a neighborhood, he thinks they would like to see a majority of the people in support of a project. He doesn't know if he can tie a percentage to that but it might be tough if it is 50/50.

Jacobs wondered for a bigger project like mountain bike trails, would you just tell them to put their word on it; presuming they would spread the word and people who want mountain bike trails would weigh in. They could also get a petition to sign or staff could do an online survey as well.

O'Dea agreed that staff can do some of the leg work.

Durbin said the mountain biking proposal was large and there was so much feedback. There is no way staff had the time to count how many people were for and against it. The park board and the city also has the right to make decisions in the public's interest even if there isn't that support. The city has that where not everything that they do is a

democracy. If they think it is a good enough idea to pursue based on some criteria, then they should go for it knowing that it will get passed to others that will make the final decision.

Woeste commented that this is really to tell staff that you should study the feasibility. The park board would essentially approve the project at a later time. This is saying that it is worth studying and putting time into.

Durbin thought it was better to give some soft yes' as long as they think they might actually pass it down the road.

O'Dea agreed with Durbin's earlier comment that a rocket ship pad is probably something they don't want to do research on because they don't feel like that is appropriate. To make sure they weed out some of those requests, staff can hold onto them and let the person know that they are the first person to request it. Then they can hold onto it and if they hear from more people, they can address it later.

Gabler thought a way to save your time is to have them show you the support, rather than us trying to figure out if it is a good project. If it is a good project, they will bring support with them.

Jacobs commented that it wouldn't be telling someone to get a petition with a certain amount of signatures. He wouldn't put a number on it but he would let them know if it is on the agenda, they should show up if they want it.

Beyersdorf said this is for a resident request so if they are coming to us, they should've already done the legwork. They should give us as much information as possible so we can make a decision.

Jacobs said however they want to do that is however they want to do that.

Gabler said that would also value staff time. Staff is a city asset and we have to value their time. We can't have them chasing around getting everything.

Jacobs said that is what he was trying to get at.

Durbin also thinks the relationship between staff and the park board is imperative. He requested that O'Dea doesn't bring a rocket ship pad to their attention. O'Dea can file the request and he will know the priority of it. Unless the board says that they want something on the agenda, staff kind of leads the way or guides them.

O'Dea added that people can bring it to us but we would likely say that we don't see it as a good use of our park system. They are more than welcome to go to the park board but it's likely that you probably won't support it.

Durbin said the park board usually agrees with staff recommendations.

Yetka wanted to reiterate, that there is some advantage to having question number three vague because it forces staff or the park board to wonder what kind of support there is and maybe they would have to do more homework. Having that ambiguity and flexibility can be helpful because it forces them to look more critically at it.

Gabler said that was an excellent point and that is why he would take the word significant out.

Jacobs said generally when people go to them, it seems like they have thought it out.

Durbin said they are passionate for sure.

Beyersdorf mentioned that the word significant doesn't always have a number meaning; it could also mean that it is significant to them. The demand is that it means something to them.

O'Dea said he is kind of hearing that if a resident had a request, staff would talk to them before the meeting and tell them to come prepared to show us numbers one, two and three. Then the park board will say it aligns with the Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Plan, it aligns with the Natural Resources Master Plan (NRMP), and there is demand. Then the park board can ask a few more questions to see if staff should continue studying it.

Gabler thought staff could say it sounds like a great request and tell them they will send them something to fill out. They can either send it back to staff or bring it to the meeting.

Ingraham thought a lot of people might know the site when they are making a request. He brought up the skate park only because it is potentially a big idea, however, they don't necessarily have to know where to put it. He assumed if someone requested adding a playground feature to an existing playground, they would know the neighborhood. For the skate park, they showed a lot of passion and skate parks are very popular in the Twin Cities. Minnetonka doesn't have one that is of commensurate appeal so it's probably worth looking at. For a lot of the bigger items, people might not know the answers to numbers four through 10. They could probably sense if it is something they should seriously be looking at though.

O'Dea asked if they are missing anything from numbers four through 10. They talked about public/private partnerships but he was curious if there are any other criteria that they want to dig into further or send to staff to evaluate more.

Gabler liked what they have because it keeps it simple. They don't want to get into paralysis by analysis.

Jacobs thought it was simple. Even if they say yes on every one, it's a process and it doesn't mean that it is happening.

Durbin added that for the funding that is currently available, it's either going to be the CIP or it is something they are working on like trying to get a grant. He's not sure if that has to be on this form though. He liked the way the form is and thought that number three is really important. He also liked the fact that they are going to make the applicants read and figure things out because that is going to weed out a lot of items. If they are going to put the burden on the applicant, staff would help them if they didn't know. Have the applicants look at the documents that guide what the park board does. If they want something in our park system, see if it aligns.

Semersky added that there is a summary at the top of the page that includes examples of projects. If you want natural resources to be part of it, maybe include one or two examples of natural resources projects.

O'Dea said staff will edit this and bring it back to see what the park board thinks. They are going to get requests and it would be nice to have the applicant look at documents from the past year and a half so they can get familiar with them.

Gabler has looked at the poster board and he wonders how many hours were in that and how many people actually know it exists. It would be nice to see work rewarded.

## **8. Park Board Member Reports**

Stroh has played a lot of tennis at the Gro Tonka Park courts and has been thinking about pickleball courts. She has noticed that usually when a group decides to play a game of pickleball, there are four adults and they all drive separately to the court. At Lone Lake Park, there are eight courts so that is at least 32 parking spots being used, plus more spots for any additional players waiting to play. If you wanted to make a facility like the one at Lone Lake Park, you would have to consider the noise of 32 cars as well as the space those cars will take up. Gro Tonka Park has three tennis courts and 11 parking spots. She thought putting one or two courts scattered among the parks might be better when considering space and noise. That is kind of what tennis and basketball have both done.

O'Dea commented that staff has received enough requests for more pickleball courts where he knows it is something that will be coming to them in the future. He thinks any feedback that the park board members can get will be important. He doesn't have a timeline for when it would come to the park board but he knows they have had a number of requests for additional pickleball courts.

Ingraham attended the August Habitat Stewardship meeting and complimented them on it. He thought it was a very interesting interaction with the volunteers, along with Yetka and Kumka. He thought Kumka did a really good job facilitating that with Heather Holm. He found it interesting and valuable. Just as an observation, at Meadow Park they are finishing installing a new playset there, which is pretty nice and impressive. He complimented the public works staff on the grading. He sees a lot of new grading on the main park paths, which he thinks are a really nice base for accessibility and normal walking because it is packed really hard now. There was a good discussion at the habitat meeting about the paths getting wide. The grading is getting wide and Kumka pointed out that it is probably equipment based. He complimented the stability of the base and said from an accessibility perspective, it is very much approved for strollers, wheelchairs, etc.

## **9. Information Items**

### **Meadow Park**

This report wasn't included in the packet. O'Dea thought they will be finishing the project next week because there is some elevation that they need to correct. It probably isn't noticeable to the average park user, however, they are needing to make a correction. Hopefully that gets corrected in the next week or so because people are anxious about getting on the new equipment.

**Fall Registration**

Assistant Recreation Director Sara Woeste gave the report.

**Ridgedale Commons**

Woeste gave the report.

**Summer Programming Review**

Woeste gave the report.

**Skate Park Mural**

Kumka gave the report.

**Cullen Nature Preserve**

Kumka gave the report.

**Purgatory**

Kumka gave the report.

Ingraham asked if we have ever done a burn on the west side of the park.

Kumka said no, but he has requested a cost to do a burn on the west side this year. There is sort of another area there where some of the woodies are creeping into the habitat and he thinks it would benefit from a burn.

**10. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items**

O'Dea gave the report.

Isabelle asked where the joint meeting will be located.

O'Dea responded that it will be here, in the lower level of the community center and it will start at 5:30 p.m.

Ingraham asked if that meeting will be televised. He remembers last year people were upset that it wasn't televised.

O'Dea said he will have to double check but he believes it will not be televised.

Durbin added that there are always minutes.

O'Dea said there are minutes and it is open to the public to attend.

#### 11. Adjournment

Jacobs moved, Durbin seconded to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 p.m. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

*Kathy Kline*

Kathy Kline  
Recreation Administrative Coordinator

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 7A  
Meeting of October 5, 2022**

<b>Subject:</b>	Guidelines for Evaluating Resident Requests for Special Projects
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities and programs
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	Anticipate, review and respond to community needs not previously identified
<b>Brief Description:</b>	The park board will review and provide feedback regarding the draft Guidelines for Evaluating Special Requests

### **Background**

The original 'Guidelines for Funding Special Projects' document was created in 1998 and amended in 2013. The intent of the document was to assist the park board and staff with project requests. This document provided a list of questions (criteria) that would help determine whether or not a specific project request would be funded. Due to the various types of requests that are presented to the park board annually, staff felt it appropriate to update the document to ensure that all requests can be evaluated properly.

At the September 7 meeting, the board provided feedback on the draft document that included the addition of a yes/no checklist as well as criteria to align with the Parks, Open Space and Trail System Plan and the Natural Resource Master Plan. Staff edited the document based on the feedback provided and have attached it for review.

The document will allow the park board to adequately review requests and direct staff to analyze the proposed project further for feasibility or reject the request.

### **Discussion Points**

- Does the criteria provided adequately address potential requests?

**Recommended Park Board Action:** Approve the Guidelines for Evaluating Special Requests document.

### **Attachments**

1. Draft Guidelines for Evaluating Special Requests

# Minnetonka Park Board

## Guidelines for Evaluating Resident Requests for Special Projects

The Minnetonka Park Board has developed the following rating system to address resident requests for special projects related to parks or recreation. Examples of special projects include, but are not limited to, facilities such as athletic fields, hockey rinks and other indoor or outdoor athletic or recreation facilities, playgrounds or nature-based play areas, new passive features such as signs or boardwalks, or habitat restoration projects in previously unrestored areas.

<b>PROJECT NAME/TYPE:</b>	
<i>Resident to complete this section.</i>	
Does the request align with priorities in the Parks, Open Space and Trail (POST)?	__Yes    __No
Does the request align with priorities in the Natural Resource Master (NRMP)?	__Yes    __No
There is demand/support for this project from the neighborhood or community.	__Yes    __No
Please describe the demand/support for the project:	
If all are "Yes", continue evaluation. If any are "No", deny request.	

**RATING SYSTEM: 1 - STRONGLY DISAGREE, 2 - DISAGREE, 3 - NEUTRAL, 4 - AGREE, 5 - STRONGLY AGREE**

<i>Staff to complete this section.</i>	
QUESTIONS	RATING
1. There is a potential site or sites that could accommodate this type of amenity/project.	__1    __2    __3    __4    __5
2. The city owns or has access to the land for the proposed use.	__1    __2    __3    __4    __5
3. This project would maintain the current land use.	__1    __2    __3    __4    __5
4. The project allows for a future amenity or activity.	__1    __2    __3    __4    __5
5. The project maintains the same level of impact (traffic, noise, etc.) to the surrounding neighbors.	__1    __2    __3    __4    __5
6. There is funding currently available for this request.	__1    __2    __3    __4    __5
7. There is opportunity for a partnership (private, school district, etc.).	__1    __2    __3    __4    __5
Score (18+ to continue):	
Next steps for staff: (research options, conduct feasibility assessment, secure funding)	

**Additional Comments:**



**Minnetonka Park Board Item 7B  
Meeting of October 5, 2022**

<b>Subject:</b>	Consideration of 2023 boat slip rates for Gray's Bay Marina
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	Conduct a review of the Gray's Bay Marina operations plan
<b>Brief Description:</b>	The park board will review Marina operations and information comparing boat slip lease fees at Gray's Bay Marina to other local boat slip facilities to determine if changes to the existing rates are warranted.

**Background**

Gray's Bay Marina opened in 2003 and consists of 29 leased boat slips, gas dock, office/restroom building and parking spaces designated for slip holders and staff. The Park Board has been involved with the marina since it was built and has reviewed the boat slip fees since that time. The last slip fee increase took effect in 2021; increasing \$100 to \$4,000 per season. Slip fees have remained at \$4,000 through this current season.

The objective of the marina business plan is to cover all operating and long-term capital costs. Since 2003 when the marina opened, the facility has exceeded the budget expectations initially established for the facility by the park board.

**Summary**

To aid in the consideration of slip fees, a matrix showing several local private and municipal operated facilities are attached. The facilities included are the same facilities reviewed in previous years and amenities at each facility vary widely. Staff believes the existing amenities at Gray's Bay Marina are more comparable to private facilities than municipal, with the exception of boat storage and mechanic services.

For comparison purposes, in the two years since 2020 the average cost of a boat slip at privately operated marinas increased 11.6% to \$6,615 (2020=\$5,926) while the average cost of a boat slip at municipal marinas increased 10.8% to \$2,131 (2020=\$1,923).

Additional factors considered when making a decision whether or not to increase rates include:

- Annual Operating Costs – This includes items such as wages, fuel, building & grounds, Lake Minnetonka Conservation District (LMCD) levy, and capital outlay.

- Past Increases - Since the facility opened in 2003 there have been six slip fee increases. The total amount of increase over the past 19 years equate to an average of 2.25% per year. Increases are outlined below:
  - 5% (\$140) increase to \$2,940 in 2006
  - 20% (\$584) increase to \$3,524 in 2007
  - 5% (\$176) increase to \$3,700 in 2008
  - 2.7% (\$100) increase to \$3,800 in 2009
  - No increase in 2010 or 2011
  - 2.6% (\$100) increase to \$3,900 in 2012
  - No increase 2013-2020
  - 2.5% (\$100) increase to \$4,000 in 2021
- Wait List – While there had been some difficulty maintaining a reasonable wait list prior to the pandemic, the current wait list has steadily increased and stands at a healthy 125, up from 103 in 2021.
- Budget Escrow – The marina escrow account balance continues to be strong and ahead of what has been budgeted since the marina opened.

Staff has attached a summary of revenue and expenses as well as escrow amounts designated to cover future long-term capital costs. As indicated, Gray's Bay Marina has met the budget objectives initially put in place.

### **Recommendation**

Taking into consideration slip rate increases around the lake as well as an opportunity to cover increasing costs of wages and other expenses, staff recommends increasing the Gray's Bay Marina boat slip fee \$200 (5%) to \$4,200 for the 2023 season.

### **Discussion Points**

- Does the park board agree with the staff recommendation to increase the boat slip fee to \$4,200 for the 2023 season?

**Recommended Park Board Action:** Review operation information attached and provide feedback on the boat slip fee increase for 2023.

### **Attachments**

1. Marina comparison matrix
2. Summary of revenue and expenses

## Local Boat Slip Facility Comparison – 2022

	Municipally Operated				Privately Operated							
Services	Deephaven	Excelsior	Wayzata	Gray's Bay	Boatworks, Wayzata	Caribbean, Tonka Bay	Excelsior Bay Harbor (Bayside Marine)	Howard's Point, Shorewood	Minnetonka Yacht Club, Deephaven	Tonka Bay (3 Locations)	North Shore, Orono	Greenwood
Attendant				✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Gas				✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Pump-out				✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓
Retail								✓				✓
Bait								✓				
On-site Restrooms	satellite	adjacent park	next to beach	permanent	adjacent park	permanent	permanent	permanent	satellite	permanent	permanent	permanent
Mechanic					✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		
Cost/foot of slip 2022 (2020)	\$46 (\$34)	\$112 res (\$109)	\$87 (\$79)	\$154 (\$150)	\$327 (\$288)	\$240 (\$225)	\$ 263 (\$211)	\$200 (\$192)	\$235 (\$222)	\$270 (\$235)	\$250 (\$225)	\$250 (\$225)
Cost per 26' slip/2022 (2020)	\$1200 (\$875)	\$2,925 (\$2,834)	\$2,268 outer (\$2,060)	\$4,000 (\$3,900)	\$8,500 (\$7,500)	\$6,240 (\$5,850)	\$6,850 (\$5,486)	\$5,200 (\$4,992)	\$ 6,117 (\$5,765)	\$7,020 (\$6,110)	\$6,500 (\$5,850)	\$6,500 (\$5,860)
Number of slips	94 Dock 15 Shore	109	100	29	80	116	93	45	27	340	118	107
Parking	Street	Street	Parking lot	Parking lot	Parking lot	Parking lot	Parking Lot	Parking lot	Parking lot	Parking lot	Parking lot	Parking Lot
Dates of operation	April 1 (Ice out) - Nov 15	Ice out - Last wknd Oct	June 10- Nov 1	Ice out - Oct 31	Ice out- Oct 31	Ice out - Oct 1 year round storage available	Ice out - Oct 31	Ice out - Oct 31	Ice out- Oct 31	June 1 – Sept 30	May 15 - Sept 15	Ice Out - Oct 1
Number of Mooring Buoys	53	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
Plans to increase slip fees in 2023	Yes (\$1400) +\$200	No	Yes - 5% +-\$100		Unsure	Unsure	Yes	Yes	Unsure	Unsure	Unsure	Yes

**Gray's Bay Marina**  
**Summary of Revenues and Expenses**

		Actual 2021	Budget 2022
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>\$279,838</b>	<b>\$265,100</b>
Expenses	(\$184,192)		(\$218,900)
Capital Outlay	\$0		\$0
LMCD	(\$37,500)		(\$30,500)
Escrow*	(\$58,146)		(\$15,700)
<b>Total Expenses</b>		<b><u>(\$279,838)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$265,100)</u></b>
<b>Balance</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

\* Total 2003-2021 amount budgeted in escrow account = \$365,400; estimated amount escrowed through 2021 = \$832,997.

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 7C  
Meeting of October 5, 2022**

<b>Subject:</b>	Review 2022 athletic field use and consideration of the 2023 fee schedule
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities and programs
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	Annually review policies related to the operation and management of parks to determine if changes are required
<b>Brief Description:</b>	The park board will review the 2022 athletic field use report and consider rates for 2023

**Background**

The city of Minnetonka provides athletic fields for a variety of community and city sponsored programs. Field fees were originally established in 2010 by the park board to streamline field reservations, process fees, and generate funds for operational maintenance and future capital projects (67% of revenue assigned to general operations and 33% to a capital fund for future upgrades to fields).

**Summary**

Estimated 2022 field hours reserved total 4,174 compared to 4,054 in 2021. Estimated field fee revenues total \$36,982 compared to \$35,969 in 2021 (Attachment – Estimated 2022 Field Use). Estimated sales tax accounts for \$944 of total revenue leaving net revenue at \$36,038. The estimated amount that would be allocated to the capital fund for future field upgrades is \$11,892.

For the 2023 season, staff is recommending an increase in all fee categories of approximately 10-12% (Attachment – 2023 Field Use Fees – Proposed), with the exception of the Big Willow and Guilliams regulation baseball fields which are recommended to increase approximately 15%. Since field fees were implemented in 2010, past increases include 2014 category C only (~25%) and 2019 approximately 10% across all categories. The following is what this increase would mean for each fee category:

- Category A – Increase of ~\$2.00-\$3.00 per hour
- Category B – Increase of ~\$2.00-\$5.00 per hour
- Category C – Increase of ~\$3.00-\$6.50 per hour (larger due to higher initial cost)

There are four organizations that have priority use of fields. They are charged an annual fee rather than an hourly fee. The impact to those organizations is outlined below:

- Girls Athletic League Softball – Increase of \$45 per season

**Item 7C – Review 2022 Athletic Field Use and Consideration of the 2023 Fee Schedule**

**October 5, 2022**

**Page 2**

---

- Glen Lake Mighty Mites – Increase of \$80 per season
- Hopkins Baseball Assoc. – Increase of \$125 per season
- Minnetonka Big Willow Baseball Assoc. – Increase of \$165 per season

**Recommended Action:** Review the 2023 field fees and provide feedback.

**Attachments:**

1. Estimated 2022 Athletic Field Use
2. 2023 Field Use Fees - Proposed

## City of Minnetonka Estimated 2022 Athletic Field Use

Dedicated Field Complex	Non-city Programs			City-sponsored Programs			Revenue		
	2020 Actual Use Hours	2021 Actual Use Hours	2022 Estimated Hours	2020 Actual Use Hours	2021 Actual Use Hours	2022 Estimated Hours	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Estimated
Big Willow Baseball - Reg	579	515	548	0	0	0	\$10,784	\$14,142	\$15,036
Big Willow Baseball - Yth	64	0	0	60	38	35	\$2,804	\$0	\$0
Big Willow Soccer	0	107	71	74	112	145	\$0	\$2,101	\$1,495
Big Willow Softball	0	0	0	627	1119	1146	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civic Center	470	571	594	227	341	312	\$5,137	\$7,164	\$7,414
Guilliams Softball	202	337	330	0	0	0	\$1,686	\$2,632	\$2,500
Glen Lake Softball	57	4	0	0	0	0	\$440	\$42	\$0
Glen Lake Yth baseball	0	7	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$280	\$0
Lone Lake Soccer	69	221	171	228	311	345	\$2,072	\$4,498	\$4,050
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1441</b>	<b>1762</b>	<b>1714</b>	<b>1216</b>	<b>1921</b>	<b>1983</b>	<b>\$22,923</b>	<b>\$30,858</b>	<b>\$30,496</b>

Non-Dedicated Field Complex	Non-city Programs			City-sponsored Programs			Revenue		
	2020 Actual Use Hours	2021 Actual Use Hours	2022 Estimated Hours	2020 Actual Use Hours	2021 Actual Use Hours	2022 Estimated Hours	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Estimated
Gro Tonka Field	72	177	189	68	96	124	\$396	\$1,041	\$1,023
Oberlin Field	0	0	79	64	98	85	\$0	\$0	\$1,393
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>\$396</b>	<b>\$1,041</b>	<b>\$2,416</b>

Designated Field Complex	Non-city Programs Est. Use Hours	Revenue		
		2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Estimated
Big Willow - Youth BB	1560	\$825	\$1,650	\$1,650
Glen Lake Youth BB	1200	\$385	\$770	\$770
Guilliams Youth BB	700	\$605	\$1,210	\$1,210
Glen Lake Youth SB	325	\$0	\$440	\$440
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,815</b>	<b>\$4,070</b>	<b>\$4,070</b>

<b>TOTAL REVENUE ALL FIELDS</b>	\$25,134	\$35,969	\$36,982
		Sales Tax	(\$944)
		<b>Net Revenue</b>	<b>\$36,038</b>

### Est. Capital/Operations Revenue Allocation

Allocated to Operations (67%) \$24,145

Allocated to Capital (33%) \$11,892

# Proposed 2023 Field Use Fees

Proposed fees in red type

	Big Willow Soccer	Big Willow Soccer w/lights	Big Willow Softball	Big Willow Softball w/lights	Big Willow Reg. Baseball	Big Willow Reg. Baseball w/lights	Guilliams Reg. Baseball	Civic Center Soccer	Lone Lake Soccer	Guilliams Youth Softball	Glen Lake Youth Softball	Glen Lake & Big Willow Youth Baseball	Glen Lake & Big Willow Youth BSB/SB W/lights	Non-Dedicated Fields – Gro-Tonka & Oberlin
<b>Category A</b>														
<b>Minimum of 50% Minnetonka/Hopkins resident participation &amp; open registration</b>	\$16/hr (\$18)	\$22/hr (\$25)	\$16/hr (per field) (\$18)	\$22/hr (per field) (\$25)	\$44 2.25 hour block (\$51)	\$61 2.25 hour block (\$70)	\$22* 2.25 hour block (\$26)	\$11/hr (per field**) (\$13)	\$16/hr (\$18)	\$8/hr (per field) (\$10)	\$8/hr* (\$10)	\$8/hr* (per field) (\$10)	\$15/hr* (\$17)	\$6/hr (\$8)
<b>Category B</b>														
<b>Minimum of 50% Minnetonka/Hopkins resident participation &amp; closed registration OR Residents for private use</b>	\$19/hr (\$21)	\$27/hr (\$30)	\$19/hr (per field) (\$21)	\$27/hr (per field) (\$30)	\$50 2.25 hour block (\$58)	\$66 2.25 hour block (\$77)	\$28 2.25 hour block (\$32)	\$16/hr (per field**) (\$18)	\$19/hr (\$21)	\$16/hr (per field) (\$18)	\$16/hr (\$18)	\$16/hr (per field) (\$18)	\$23/hr (per field) (\$26)	\$9/hr (\$11)
<b>Category C</b>														
<b>Less than 50% Minnetonka/Hopkins resident participation OR non-resident</b>	\$49/hr (\$54)	\$60/hr (\$66)	\$40/hr (per field) (\$44)	\$48/hr (per field) (\$53)	\$84 2.25 hour block (\$97)	\$100 2.25 hour block (\$115)	\$78 2.25 hour block (\$90)	\$44/hr (per field**) (\$49)	\$49/hr (\$54)	\$40/hr (per field) (\$44)	\$40/hr (\$44)	\$40/hr (per field) (\$44)	\$48/hr (per field) (\$53)	\$17/hr (\$20)

\*fee for renters other than primary users listed in field use policy

\*\*a civic center field is half of the total field space



**Minnetonka Park Board Item 9  
Meeting of October 5, 2022**

<b>Subject:</b>	Information Items
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	N/A
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	N/A
<b>Brief Description:</b>	The following are informational items and developments that have occurred since the last park board meeting.

**Recycling in parks**

Public works staff have finished installing 23 recycling bins at Civic Center, Meadow, Lone Lake, Big Willow, and Purgatory parks. The lids have openings in them to allow recycling of plastic bottles and aluminum cans in an effort to reduce the amount of contamination in the recycling.

**Robinwood Park**

Playground equipment is tentatively scheduled for installation the week of October 3. Due to supply chain and shipping issues, the installation date has been pushed back several times.

**Meadow Park**

The new playground equipment was installed in August, and upon completion of the installation it was discovered that the large play structure was installed approximately 1 foot higher than planned. One of the primary goals with the new play equipment was to have a very large play area that is more accessible for handicapped users through the use of poured rubber surfacing around the 2-5 year old play equipment, and a ramp and poured rubber surfacing connecting to the large 5-12 year old play equipment. Staff worked with the vendor to reconfigure the connecting area between the two play structures to maintain ADA grades. The small play structure and swings areas were opened for use on September 16, and the large play structure is scheduled to be open by October 7.

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 10  
Meeting of October 5, 2022**

<b>Upcoming 6-Month Meeting Schedule</b>				
<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Meeting Type</b>	<b>Agenda Business Items</b>	<b>Special Notes</b>
<b>Wed</b>	11/2/22	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural Resources Master Plan Implementation: Park Habitat Restoration and Maintenance Plans</li> <li>Lone Lake Park Multi-use mountain bike trail annual update</li> <li>Skate Park Feasibility Report</li> </ul>	Joint meeting w/council 5:30 pm start
<b>Wed</b>	12/7/22	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of 2022 Farmer's Market Operations and recommendations for 2023</li> <li>Shady Oak Beach season recap and 2023 fees</li> <li>NR Education, Outreach and Engagement Plan</li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	1/4/23	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appointment of chair and vice-chair</li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	2/1/23	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	3/1/23	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of outdoor ice rinks</li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	4/5/23	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	No meeting

**Other meetings and activities to note:**

<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Special Notes</b>
<b>Fri</b>	10/28/22	Burwell Spooktacular	Burwell House grounds, 5-8 pm

**Items to be scheduled:**

**Park regulation ordinance – dogs/leash requirements  
Climate Action & Adaptation Plan**